

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION AND REHABILITATIVE SERVICES

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20202

OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS

FISCAL YEAR 1998

GRANT PERFORMANCE REPORT FOR CONTINUATION FUNDING

I. **Cover sheet.** Complete cover sheet with appropriate information.

This is the first budget period for this grant. Cover sheet is enclosed.

II. **Project Summary.** Provide one or two paragraphs that briefly describe the project.

As stated on page 28 of California's application under "b.1-2. Significance of the Proposed Project", "the central purpose of the State Improvement Grant (SIG) is to improve outcomes for individuals with disabilities" consistent with the purpose stated in the CFDA 84.323A Request For Proposal.

Background:

The reauthorization of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) in 1997 allowed the state education agencies and their partners to submit a competitive grant proposal to expand and broaden the "comprehensive system of personnel development" which has been a requirement of the law since 1975. The California Department of Education (CDE) seized the unique opportunity to forge new broad-scale, collaborative partnerships. The Partnership Committee on Special Education (PCSE), in compliance with IDEA §1452(b), consisting of over eighty entities developed the California strategic plan, a document that served as a foundation for the State Improvement Plan and this SIG. That strategic plan was developed with input from parents, educators, and interested community members from around the state (See "c.2.viii. Linkages with other appropriate agencies and organizations" p. 49 and a complete PCSE listing in Appendix A). That strategic plan for the grant focused on 1) implementing IDEA; 2) issues of non-compliance in federal review of State's compliance to IDEA; 3) recommendations of the State AB 602 Special Education Reform Act workgroups; and 4) the ten "required elements of an effective educational system" that are outlined in federal law (IDEA §1451[a][6]): high academic standards, education reform coordination, results, service integration/coordination, transition standards, comprehensive system of personnel development, research-based strategies, disciplinary strategies, funding, and consumer/parent involvement (See "Introduction", p.1-3).

The goals, objectives and activities of the SIG incorporate each of these ten elements. The activities are described to the three audiences of the grant: **student, teacher/potential teacher and systems** (See the "d.1. Quality of Project Services", pp. 51-68). Over the next five years, grant dollars will be used to fund teacher training and other related activities to improve education for all children, with a focus on better results for individuals with disabilities.

III. **Project Status.**

The California Department of Education, Special Education Division (SED), was notified of the SIG award in early February 1999. Based on prior communication and planning, a budget revision was immediately submitted to the California Department of Finance requesting the State budget authority to expend the 1,840,000 per year for five years. Without this fiscal authority CDE could not have drawn down any funds; therefore, the first year of the grant period would

have been lost. The legislature and Governor did approve the budget revision and the work financed by the SIG did commence. On July 1, 1999, a contractual relationship with Sonoma State University, a pre-service partner, was finalized. It should be noted that many of the activities covered by this Performance Report had only **five months**, July 1, 1999 to December 7, 1999, in the reported "first year" of the SIG.

In section, "d.1. Quality of the services provided by the proposed project", pp. 51-68, the Partnership presents a description of each activity and the projected timeline for implementation. However, it is important to note that the role of the Partnership is to annually up-date and revise the strategic plan and that these actions will be based on the data generated from the activities and objective measures in the previous year. Therefore, the activity descriptions and timelines **will** be adjusted annually through the Partnership's data-informed assessment process.

Activities are discussed below in the order in which they appear in section b.1-2, pp. 28; a numerical order list is available in Appendix F. The objectives are also included as they appeared in that section. However, the objectives are discussed separately in Appendix A. The focus of the discussion of the objectives is on data sources and proposed adjustments. As many of the grant funded activities are in the first six months of implementation, measurable progress toward the objectives was not anticipated.

Students

Student Objectives

- (a) To increase, by at least 10 percent, the percentage of students with disabilities who are performing equal to or better than the average of students without disabilities, on the STAR state assessment instruments.
- (b) To increase, by at least 3 percent per year, the positive results achieved by individuals with disabilities on the school and post-school outcomes developed and articulated with statewide standards in Year One of the grant period, as defined by the assessment instruments cited in the adopted standards.
- (c) To increase, by at least 3 percent per year, the percentage of parents rating the assistance and support in making transitions for their individuals with disabilities, at a level of at least "4" (very satisfactory) on a project-developed survey, five-point Likert scale.
- (d) To reduce the rate of suspensions and expulsions of students with disabilities by at least 3 percent per year to reach a level of parity with the rate of general education students, as indicated by data aggregated by the state from school reports.
- (e) To increase the percentage of special education students earning a high school diploma or GED by at least 3 percent per year until the percentage is equal to or higher than that of non-disabled students, as indicated by data aggregated by the state from school reports.

Activity 1: CDE will develop key performance indicators, benchmarks, and an aligned expanded curriculum with appropriate modifications for individuals with disabilities ages 0-22.

Since 1997-98 to present, the State Board of Education (SBE) has established state academic standards, by grade, in the core subject areas of reading/language arts, mathematics, science, and social studies/history with "curriculum frameworks" adopted for reading/language arts and mathematics. These curriculum frameworks specifically address accommodation issues for high-risk students and students with disabilities. Additionally, the SBE recently adopted the 2002 English Language Arts/English Language Development Adoption Criteria requiring alignment to California English Language Arts Content Standards and with universal access and accommodation issues addressed for high-risk students with disabilities.

During the last eighteen months, CDE worked in concert with strategic stakeholders to establish the key performance indicators and benchmarks according to the Government Performance Results Act guidelines. These key indicators and benchmarks, developed over an eighteen-month period of time, are incorporated into CDE's new Quality Assurance Process (QAP) system being piloted during 1999-2000. CDE's web site <http://www.cde.ca.gov/spbranch/sed/qapnow.htm> provides a listing of these indicators and additional information. Because the monitoring/evaluation is an integral part of the system of key performance indicators and benchmarks, the indicators and benchmarks themselves may be somewhat adjusted on the basis of the pilot monitoring year, and as new, more complete data sources are available. CDE has preliminary positive results from the "Desired Outcomes Project" which is collaboratively developing the performance standards for early childhood.

Activity 3: CDE will provide resource, referral, and technical assistance for educators, service providers, and families/consumers.

Technical assistance delivered in the first three quarters of 1999:

To the field

- A total of 82 technical assistance requests were submitted - 9 in the first quarter, 25 in the second quarter, and 48 in the third quarter.
- Of the 82 requests submitted, 39 were completed as of September 1999 - 14 in the first quarter, 12 in the second quarter, and 13 in the third quarter.
- Of the 82 requests submitted, the number pending are 12 in the first quarter, 13 in the second quarter, and 35 in the third quarter. The pending requests represent those that support system change and require consultation over a period of months.

Examples of topics

- family partnerships
- IDEA '97 changes/applications
- parent/professional collaboration
- advocacy
- RCC capacity building
- early intervention/prevention

- behavior planning
- TEACH training, curriculum layering, system change, general education/special education collaboration, principal's/administrator's role in special education, administrator/principal training on system change and special education, positive behavior intervention, transition, non-public/public school collaboration, culturally relevant services, literacy

Examples of actual requests

- Development of standards for serving students at risk for academic failure, as well as their families
- Special education within the juvenile justice system, teacher recruitment, and retention practices
- Coordination of services for students with emotional and behavior disorders, culturally relevant assessment, translation for complaint investigation, and teachers as researchers
- System change/program development per AB602 as supported by the "Neverstreaming" model in Elk Grove and other sites that are implementing non-traditional programs, service delivery, and/or strategies

Technical assistance requests are being compiled for the current quarter. The number of technical assistance requests has significantly increased. Requests demonstrate an increasing emphasis on systems change; development of student success teams; general education/special education collaboration; strategic planning; development of processes for early identification, assessment, and interventions for students struggling with literacy or who exhibit behavior problems; and increased coordination of comprehensive service delivery for students with emotional and behavior disorders. Participation evaluations indicate a high rate of satisfaction with the assistance provided.

The state's goal is to implement technical assistance and training throughout the existing Comprehensive System of Personnel Development (CSPD) councils in the eleven regions in California. To accomplish this goal, exceptional communication, coordination, and collaboration between general education and special education personnel development entities are required. The first year has been an opportunity for the special education personnel development councils to understand their roles and responsibilities. The SIG parent/professional consultant teams support this capacity-building process. We recognize that the goal of providing personnel development through a coordinated system to meet the needs of **all** children requires significant systems change. The SIG technical assistance efforts are prepared to support system change over the ensuing years.

Activity 4: An improved individual transition planning process will be implemented, leading to increased use of goals and benchmarks.

The activities described in the application, p 54, are being followed:

- During 1999, CDE has developed policies and procedures that lead to an integrated IEP that includes the goals and objectives of transition services. The California Policies and Procedures for Special Education are currently receiving a sixty-day public comment period before SBE is expected to approve and submit to the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) by April 2000.
- Additionally, draft "Retention/Promotion Guidelines" was developed and is receiving feedback at this time.

- Since August 1999, CDE, SED Staff, in collaboration with the Advisory Commission on Special Education (ACSE) has been developing accommodations in accordance with IDEA '97 to the new California High School Exit Exam, which all students will be required to pass for graduation beginning in 2003.
- Pilot training in integrated IEP/ITP process is being conducted this year, 1999-2000, as described in the SIG with curriculum modification, materials and expanded work during subsequent years of the SIG as indicated by the data.
- CDE, in collaboration with Employment Development Department (EDD), is developing a video for secondary classroom use, "It's Your Future", which outlines the steps for transition planning.

Activity 8: CDE will collaborate with other agencies to increase the use of regional multi-disciplinary, interagency, and community resource teams with experts across settings and agencies from schools and institutions of higher education by implementing Government Code (G.C.) 26.5

- California Services for Technical Assistance and Training (CalSTAT), a contracted project of CDE, will utilize Part B-IDEA moneys to provide training in interagency support for the development and implementation of behavior plans for children with difficult and/or complex behavioral issues. Technical assistance follow up may be provided through Activity 3.
- The interagency agreement with the Department of Mental Health is under development. CDE delayed until later years of the SIG the development, an interagency task force of the named agencies. The task force will determine 1) how the collaboration can help deliver the goals of each agency; 2) what format it should take; 3) how services can best be delivered; 4) how resources should be re-directed by each agency; 5) what the implementation timeline should be and 6) how the success of the effort should be measured.

Activity 10: CDE will develop recommendations to the Distinguished School Recognition Program for expanded criteria to include demonstration of inclusive programs for individuals with disabilities and the expanded use of site-based Student Success Teams to collaboratively problem solve strategies for students with learning difficulties.

Due to increased staff demands in developing and initiating the pilot for QAP, this Activity was not initiated during the first year of the SIG. Although, as described (p. 53) the Distinguished School Recognition Program application has a strong scoring rubric linking to the use of the site-based Student Success Teams (a.k.a. Student Study Teams).

Activity 12: CDE will use the new QAP and its four elements (local plan, coordinate compliance review, complaint management and focused monitoring) to monitor the practices in an educational agency that relate to effective learning for students and ensure the enforcement of the protections guaranteed under the law to students with disabilities and their parents. Local Education Agencies (LEAs) will be monitored for successful mechanisms providing interagency coordination to meet individual needs for transition, behavior plans, and early childhood education.

See CDE's web site <http://www.cde.ca.gov/spbranch/sed/qapnow.htm> for a concise description of the work completed during the last eighteen months and listing of goals, objectives, key performance indicators and measures.

QAP process is being developed and implemented by CDE to ensure high educational results for children with disabilities. The main stay component of QAP is focused monitoring -- a data informed system. This system is a vehicle for monitoring compliance/non-compliance in local education agencies by reviewing performance indicators that are aligned with state government standards and accountability. The purpose of QAP is to monitor the practices in an educational agency that related to effective learning for students and to ensure the enforcement of the protections guaranteed under the law to students with disabilities and their families.

CDE is restructuring the monitoring system for LEAs. QAP is being piloted in year one of the SIG, 1999-2000. The concept behind QAP is to zero in on the essential elements for ensuring improvement in outcomes for students with special needs while assuring compliance to federal and state laws. The focused monitoring reviews target LEAs that may be experiencing systemic problems with compliance, as indicated by the available data, and would focus on the area(s) of suspected noncompliance. Thus the approach integrates compliance issues under the greater umbrella of quality services to produce excellent results for students. QAP will use many key performance indicators and benchmarks aligned with the objectives in the SIG.

Activity 20: School site plans will reflect the inclusion of special education students to ensure active student participation in all aspects of the school community, contributions to a positive learning environment, and understanding of diversity and diverse cultures.

This activity was scheduled for year 2.

Activity 22: The State will require that local programs identify and document the use of curricular frameworks that support State standards. The State will encourage the use of positive school environments that support parent training, individual learning, a sense of community, peacemaking, cultural awareness, and celebration of diversity, as developed and described in comprehensive safe schools plans and annual school report cards.

- Like Activity 20 above, this activity was scheduled for year 2. To allow for the completion of QAP pilot prior to the work on this requirement. This activity will most probably result in changes in the school Site Plans, as well as the Comprehensive Safe School Plans.
- Although the original activity described in SIG was delayed, CDE did take meaningful action. During year one of the SIG, CDE developed new Special Education Local Plan Area (SELPA) criteria for funding through school year 2003. Included is a strong component addressing the California Reading Initiative and targeting personnel development opportunities for special educators in areas such as state adopted standards, frameworks, research based instructional strategies for teaching reading to diverse learners; ensuring access to students with disabilities to all required core curriculum and supplementary text books; and educational supports necessary for students to make progress in meeting state standards in reading and language arts.
- Also in 1999, CDE and SBE convened a joint task force to make recommendations regarding statewide efforts to improve student performance in reading and language arts. In November 1999, the Special Education Reading Task Force released their report "The California Reading Initiative and Special Education in California: Critical Ideas Focused on Meaningful Reform" which addresses the importance of the California Reading Initiative and includes discussion about early reading intervention and prevention assessment, access to its core curriculum and practices linked to research. This will be distributed to every school site, all superintendents of districts and county offices, SELPA, professional and parent organizations and available on CDE's web site.

Activity 24: Students' active participation in their educational planning will result in increased student independence/self-determination.

The Partnership determined that this should be a year 3 activity. CDE, in collaboration EDD, is developing a video for secondary classroom use, "It's Your Future", which outlines the steps for transition planning.

Activity 25: CDE will document the effectiveness of WorkAbility I (WAI) Program with the goal of increasing successful post-secondary student outcomes and movement toward each individual's achievement of his/her highest level of employment.

The Department will address this as a year 2 activity. CDE did submit a Budget Change Proposal to the CFD to **fully** fund WAI statewide. The new state budget will be released in January 2000.

Activity 30: CDE will assist LEAs in developing and maintaining valid, quality, results-oriented data collection processes, as required in the newly-implemented QAP mandated for all LEAs (K-12). Data collected will include both in-school and post-secondary and employment success indicators and will be reported in a standardized meaningful format, aligned with the California Statewide Performance Based Accountability System, and appropriate for public interpretation.

- During year one, the data requirements were developed meeting the intention of this activity and are being tested for feasibility simultaneously with the performance indicators and benchmarks through implementation of the pilot year of QAP. This activity provides the data foundation for the key performance indicators and benchmarks to be developed in alignment with Government Performance Results Act (GPRA) requirements and the State frameworks standards for all students, as detailed in Activity 1, p. 51.

As the data requirements are developed, CDE will work with Sonoma State University as the Grant contractor for training and technical assistance, to create professional development and follow up packages to assist the LEAs and SELPAs in initiating valid data collection procedures and, later, to assist them in reporting the data to the public according to the formats developed to maximize user-friendliness.

- As the system evolves, data will be used by the Partnership and at the State, local, and interagency levels to plan program and services, choose curriculum and materials, develop staffing patterns, allocate funds, and adjust pre-service and in-service training and technical assistance to improve student results.

The Teachers

Teachers/Potential Teachers Objectives

- To reduce the rate of special education teachers with a 30-day substitute emergency permit or 30-day substitute emergency permit waiver by at least 3 percent each year, as reported by the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CCTC).
- To reduce the rate of special education teachers who are less than fully credentialed (emergency permits and credential waivers) by at least 3 percent each year, as reported by CCTC.
- To increase by at least 3 percent per year the percentage of special and general education teachers who have responded that in-service training, resources, and/or technical assistance have helped them implement research-based strategies in the classroom, particularly those strategies related to increasing reading/language arts skills, academic achievement, and post-school results; improving transitions; ensuring positive behavioral supports; and increasing involvement/collaboration of parents in their child's education, as reported through QAP.

Activity 2: CDE, partner agencies, and local educational agencies, in collaboration with institutions of higher education, will provide a comprehensive system of inservice personnel development and family education that includes training and information dissemination

This "mega-training activity" will be initiated in year one partly through Part B funds in the current CalSTAT contract and partly through the SIG funds. The "mega-training" activity has several components:

- Face-to-Face Training: One-day curriculum, course materials, and trainers are available through the CalSTAT training menu. The eleven California Regional Coordinating Councils (RCC) have agreed to provide approximately 100 days of training throughout the state of California in the first fiscal year of the grant. RCC define and submit for State approval a CSPD Family Education Plan that includes the title, content, and type of training's to be selected from the CalSTAT training menu. Topics from the menu reflect the identified priorities of the Partnership for training relative to OSEP-identified compliance issues. RCC are currently submitting plans for approval and implementing their 2000 training schedules.
- SELPA Matching Funds: The RCC also work to support the disbursement and planning for the utilization of SELPA matching dollars for training in the areas of reading/literacy and discipline/positive behavioral supports. The utilization of these funds is reflected in the previously described CSPD Family Education Plan submitted by each RCC.
- Face-to-Face Comprehensive Personnel Development Leadership Institutes: In addition, the RCC have committed to sending 10 to 12 person teams to each of three Leadership Institutes to be offered the first fiscal year of the grant. Each Institute will have a distinct topic. The three topics are Discipline/Positive Behavioral Supports, Reading/Literacy, and Collaboration. The Leadership Institutes will prepare local stakeholders to serve as professional trainers in their communities. Most importantly, the State department will cultivate a group of trainers who will deliver "core messages" to local areas that reflect accurate and current information in areas relative to compliance and competency. Leadership Institutes are scheduled for March, May and June of 2000.
- On-line wrap around training to the Leadership Institutes: In addition to the face-to-face Leadership Institutes, participants will spend a total of four weeks on-line. The on-line teaching shell will reflect a "conference" type environment for continuous learning. Guest speakers, regional homerooms for chatting, and cutting edge information from the State will provide comprehensive follow-up to the three face-to-face institutes.
- On-line Training: Five on-line courses will also be offered the first fiscal year. Each course is three weeks in length. Trainers are updating curriculum and adapting the on-line environment for this year's use. The training's are scheduled for delivery in March of 2000.

Priorities were initially set by CDE based on the prioritization of the Partnership and the need for training relative to OSEP-identified compliance issues

Activity 5: Institutions of higher education will implement preservice credential programs for general and special education, beginning at the undergraduate level so that intensive training in research-based practices can be addressed at the graduate level, resulting in better teacher preparation to serve all students.

In the application on p. 57, this activity is addressed by the "2042 Panel" established by CCTC to rewriting the standards for professional preparation to encourage early preparation, as mandated by AB 2042, without negative side effects. The panel began their work in the Spring 1999 for what is scheduled to be a two year process, including the period during which CCTC will write the regulations.

Activity 7: CDE will implement a pilot program to financially support special education "30 day substitutes" who are recommended by their districts and agree to enroll in CCTC approved programs, particularly those from underrepresented groups (including individuals with disabilities), resulting in an increase of fully credentialed graduates.

The CCTC will assist in the disbursement of funds to individuals seeking to complete their California Teaching Credential. They will do so by supporting pre-intern teachers who qualify for a long-term emergency permit but do not meet the subject matter requirement to enter an intern program. The program authorizes the creation and expansion of pre-intern programs, enabling education agencies to provide the support and training necessary to assist teachers, in the classroom on an emergency basis, in completing teacher training. Dollars will be allocated to subsidize teachers from underrepresented groups whose goal is to teach within special education. Disbursement of funds will occur in January 2000.

Activity 17: The State will require preservice and inservice training for special and general education teachers and service providers that ensures positive behavior management and supports and is consistent with State and federal law inclusive of

- **managing safe and positive learning environments for diverse learners,**
- **developing behavior strategies and positive behavioral supports based on functional analysis,**
- **providing effective academic and social skills instruction, and**
- **collaborating with agencies and other community resources, as appropriate, in developing, implementing, and modifying behavioral support plans.**

Several training opportunities planned for the year 2000 speak to the need for pre-service and in-service training pertaining to positive behavioral supports. A one-day training curriculum was designed to satisfy the immediate needs of professionals and para-professionals in the classroom. Additionally, a series of Leadership Institutes has been planned to communicate state core messages while training locals to serve as trainers within their communities.

- CDE provides a one-day face-to-face training available to the field, which can be accessed free of charge through a state-supported diagnostic center or through a state-created menu of trainings. The menu is utilized by the California Regional Coordinating Council system, which covers the geographic regions of the entire state. Councils meet annually to plan training and technical assistance, and to select from the menu of potential trainings. Training is designed to meet local needs for audiences in

the field with time constraints and limited resources in positive behavioral supports. "Behavior Plans Consistent with IDEA Mandates" addresses behavior plans for students who exhibit any "behavior that impedes learning" in accordance with IDEA 1997. From February 1 to December 7, 1999, over 1,849 professionals and parents have attended this training. Over 485 have attended the newly offered "One Page Behavior Plans That Work" which addresses all educators involved in designing, implementing and monitoring behavior support plans. An expanded delivery of this curriculum is expected.

- Additionally, the state is planning to conduct three Leadership Institutes in the year 2000. Each institute will consist of a three-day, face-to-face training, with three weeks of Internet wrap-around follow-up and training. One of the institutes will focus on positive behavioral supports. Each Regional Coordinating Council will send teams of approximately ten to twelve people who will, on completing the institute, function as trainers for their region in communicating the state's core messages on positive behavioral supports in the context of violence free, safe schools.

Activity 21: The State will develop an incentive program for institutions of higher education to provide additional, easily accessible special education credential-required courses, including training in the use of collaborative strategies, which will be available to IHEs that have individual waiting lists and have had all courses offered on campus in the last year filled to capacity and that promote coordination with general education faculty as required in the new California Education Specialist Credential Standards.

In November 1999, the design, implementation plan, and timelines for the incentive program were drafted. The Request for Proposals will be submitted to the field of higher education on April 1, 2000. Thereafter, a selection committee will review, select, and award five institutions of higher education approximately \$10,000 annually for two consecutive years. Dollars will support plans providing additional special education, credential-required courses.

Activity 23: Standards and regulations will be developed and adopted for paraprofessionals funded by Part C moneys and other paraprofessionals serving individuals with disabilities birth through age 21, resulting in improved quality of services for all individuals and families and improved individual outcomes.

This activity is included in the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the required contractual partners as a joint effort of CDE, CCTC, and the Department of Developmental Services (DDS). Year 1 will be a planning and exploratory year to establish the parameters and approaches to be taken in year 2 to develop the implementation plan which will take effect, with appropriate legislation, in year 3.

Activity 27: CDE and CCTC will collaborate with the Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment (BTSA) to increase the number of beginning special education teachers who receive services to promote retention.

The Governor fully funding the BTSA program in 1998 and thus removed one of the major barriers previously faced in getting support for special education teachers. CDE, SED and CCTC worked on the BTSA application to ensure that all beginning special education teachers, even those who were former general education teachers, receive the full support of the BTSA program. This criterion was added to

the BTSA application and is currently 6 months behind being distributed to the field due to development issues.

Activity 28: CDE will facilitate partnerships among institutions of higher education, districts, CCTC, the legislative community, and Statewide agencies to ensure systemic support and appropriate incentives resulting in increased special education teacher recruitment (including individuals with disabilities) through partnering with the Center on Teaching Careers (CalTeach).

The stated activity (see p. 60-61) is delayed until the Spring 2000; however, completion of a CDE recruitment of qualified personnel was developed and on CDE's web site <http://www.cde.ca.gov/spbranch/sed/recruit.htm> . CDE is investigating other options in developing a recruitment plan and implementing strategies.

Activity 29: CDE and the DDS will collaborate to develop comprehensive personnel and program standards for all early intervention professionals serving individuals from birth through age 2, resulting in improved quality of services for all individuals and families and improved individual outcomes.

Currently, DDS is the lead agency for Part C and provides the bulk of the services for the population of children with disabilities. CDE receives some Part C funds for direct services through LEAs and administrative costs of implementing Part C requirements in LEAs. The primary initiative for development of Part C system components is with the lead agency, which relies on the State Interagency Coordinating Council for advice and the California Early Intervention Technical Assistance Network (CEITAN) for state and local technical assistance.

CEITAN is working with the Quality Assurance Committee of the California Early Intervention Interagency Coordinating Council to draft personnel and program standards for personnel serving children with disabilities or at risk of disabilities birth through 2 and their families. The draft produced by this group is the document that will be addressed in this activity.

The System

System Objectives

- Improve by at least 10 percent the extent to which educational reform initiatives address needs of individuals with disabilities, as demonstrated by the following indicators:
 1. Presence of parent and/or professional representing individuals with disabilities at key initiative committees on decision-making levels (state, SELPA and school site)
 2. Response to training, technical assistance and/or resources provided by the initiative to assist general and special education teachers, other professionals and families in addressing the needs of individuals with disabilities
 3. Increased participation of special education teachers, service providers, and parents in general education reform initiatives and training
- Increase by 10 percent the amount of instructional time that California students with disabilities spend in the general education environment compared to 1998 to 1999 baseline information in the California Special Education Management and Information System (CASEMIS) mainstream data field.

1. Significantly increase the extent to which state funding of special education is placement-neutral and reflects cost-effective strategies, as described in state statute
2. Increase the involvement of consumers and parents of individuals with disabilities in planning, implementing and evaluating systemic change/educational reforms, as demonstrated by the presence of parents and/or consumers representing diverse communities on local and statewide committees related to systemic change/educational reform.

Activity 6: A comprehensive statewide network of individuals with disabilities/parents/professionals in partnerships will reflect the diversity of our individual population and be aligned with reform mandates and initiatives.

- A series of three Regional Forums on Family Partnerships took place in the spring, 1999. Forum participants were parents and professionals who reflect the diversity of the state. In addition to extensive facilitated networking, each forum produced a set of recommendations for modeling and encouraging partnerships to improve education. Recommendations were synthesized by regional representatives at the State Panel on Family Partnerships and presented to PCSE and ACSE. PCSE utilized the recommendations in their decision-making processes for implementing the activities of SIG.
- A Family Partnerships Website was created to provide information on the forums as they progressed.
- On-line interactive databases were created to enable families, individuals with disabilities, and professionals to share information about tools and strategies for encouraging family partnerships. Comprehensive outreach was extended to individuals and organizations throughout the state to inform them of the availability of the databases and to encourage input.
- An on-line Family Participation Directory was created to identify families who are interested in participating in a variety of partnership activities. Outreach is on-going.
- Family Leadership Training has been available to support families in participating in state and regional decision making bodies.
- Planning for regional forums for Spring, 2000 is underway. Forums will be organized and coordinated through MOU with IDEA-funded parent centers. Forums will focus on partnerships with underrepresented families. Extensive outreach and support will enable participation of culturally, economically, and geographically diverse families. All participants will be encouraged to become a part of the Family Participant Directory network.
- SED has implemented the practice of inviting parents and advocates on all state level advisory/decision making bodies (e.g., ACSE; Special Education Reading Task Force; PCSE; AB602 Workgroup)

Activity 9: Support for increased, appropriate participation in general education activities by students with special needs will be ensured by strengthening fiscal and programmatic incentives and eliminating the class size-reduction limit disincentive.

This activity describes the goal of providing services to special education in a funding-neutral and cost-effective manner that meets the needs of individuals with disabilities while improving compliance with state and federal laws as addressed in the 1997 Special Education Reform Act (AB 602).

- As recommended by the AB 602 Workgroups, CDE's complaints, monitoring, local plan review, and data gathering functions were coordinated into a system of compliance monitoring and enforcement. Many of the features of the new QAP incorporates these recommendations which are being piloted this year, 1999-2000. During 1999-2000, three specific sanctions on LEAs in cases of persistent noncompliance were made possible: 1) withholding federal IDEA funds without back filling with State general fund dollars; 2) filing a writ of mandate in State Civil Court on the LEA superintendent and Board; and 3) a required public hearing held by the local school board for instances of substantial noncompliance. CDE has begun the implementation of many recommendations from the Report regarding administrative procedures and the final report from the Workgroup was submitted to the legislature (March 1999). Legislation containing statutory changes was introduced as a result of the final Workgroup report during the 1999 legislative session, AB 355
- As stated in SIG application, the beginning of year one and carrying into year two, CDE will work with the legislature to eliminate the disincentive for inclusion in the class size reduction law. During year one of the SIG, ACSE held public hearings on Special Day Class size/case load limits. As a result of these hearings, AB570 was introduced into the legislature and is a two-year bill.

Activity 11: The nine state and federal agencies and the statewide consumer/family coalition which developed the School-To-Work Interagency Transition Partnership (SWITP) MOU will fully implement the activities and work to enhance and expand interagency service linkages resulting in individuals in special education receiving all needed services.

CDE was delayed in initiating its' part of this activity during year one of SIG due to key staff resignations, one of the original SWIPT coordinators and another consultant who worked with the Department of Rehabilitation (See pp 63-64 of the application).

Activity 13: A State-level workgroup, including agency representatives and parents, will define criteria and expected outcomes for effective programs and services that integrate and coordinate interagency services, such as social, health, mental health, and employment, and CDE will require that school site plans address these criteria and outcomes.

Activities 13 and 8 will be initiated after the implementation of the pilot year of QAP.

Activity 14: Fiscal resources will be in place for representatives of all cultural, linguistic, socioeconomic, geographical, and disability groups to support their participation on policy and decision making bodies.

- Through the Family Partnerships Forum process, parents and professionals worked together to recommend guidelines for the use of the \$100,000 SIG Family Participation Fund. Guidelines were adopted by PCSE.
- The Family Participation Fund will be administered regionally by IDEA-funded parent centers. MOU are in place for all eleven education regions in the state. Parent centers will conduct outreach to diverse families and evaluation methods will track the diversity of the families accessing the fund.
- State matching dollars were used to fund mini-grants to implement family leadership development for the parent centers administering the fund. This was done in response to forum/panel recommendations that families should have access to training in preparing them to be full participants in decision-making bodies.

Activity 15: CDE will establish a central point of contact related to student diversity which will ensure appropriate assessment and evaluation of strengths/needs for all students, appropriate strategies to improve access to all systems for all populations, and full utilization of all resources by all populations.

Instead of establishing the position of ombudsman in SED, CDE established the Procedural Safeguards and Referral Service Unit (PSRS) as the central point of contact to provide easy access to technical assistance and resources for parents and other interested parties, to simplify the Procedural Safeguard complaints process and to provide the public with more timely information and accurate responses. Phone calls to the 800 line ([800] 926-0648) are answered on an electronic rotation system. A staff of analysts and consultants are available each day to customers to answer questions, explain procedural safeguards, and assist them to reconcile their special education related concerns locally with the school district. Consultants who process correspondence also facilitate early resolution of disagreements. Contacts are made with the correspondent, the school district and the SELPA as appropriate. The district is encouraged to continue to resolve the dispute locally especially during the first 10 days of the resolution timeline, but continuing as needed throughout the full investigation. The timeline for resolution is 60 days. Since the Unit's inception in January 1999, nearly 5,000 individual intakes have been recorded with fewer than 800 being opened as formal complaints. PSRS is proving to be a key to customer satisfaction and the resolution of disputes regarding the education of students with disabilities. Staff is available to support Spanish speaking consumers. A revised parent rights brochure and pamphlet consistent with IDEA 97 and its' implementing regulations is being published during the winter of 1999.

CDE has appropriated *four* times the original cost of \$200,000 for this task. The role of this unit is consistent with the description given in the SIG application (See p. 65).

Activity 16: A variety of supports will be available to increase responsiveness of the service delivery system to all individuals/families/community members.

- Regional Family Forums focusing on building partnerships with underrepresented families will involve extensive outreach (see Activity 6).
- A state symposium on partnerships with underrepresented families is being planned for the spring, 2000.
- Successful national models for building family partnerships have been identified by extensive research through a contract with the Matrix Family Resource Center. Information on the models is readily available through a searchable on-line database.
- Information on successful tools and strategies that are being used in California to model and encourage family partnerships at all levels is being shared through an on-line database.
- Agreements have been reached with IDEA-funded parent centers in the north and south of the state to implement outreach to African American families that include student members identified for or at risk of needing special education services. SIG dollars will fund part-time outreach workers in both locations.
- Via a statewide 800 number ([800] 926-0648), the PSRS provides clients with information and referrals on over 60 major topics for resolving disputes regarding the education of students with disabilities.
- Planning for regional forums for Spring 2000 is underway. Forums will be organized and coordinated through MOU with IDEA-funded parent centers. Forums will focus on partnerships with underrepresented families. Extensive outreach and support will enable the participation of culturally, economically, and geographically diverse families. All participants will be encouraged to become a part of the Family Participant Directory network.

Activity 18: The State will model collaboration between general education and special education in its leadership, its focus on research-based reform, and its focus on quality as well as compliance, as evidenced by special education involvement in all aspects of education reform.

- Focused Monitoring and Technical Assistance (FMTA)-model based on FMTA District Team of general and special Educators charged improving student performance through systematic changes.
- CalSTAT Institute - General Education and Special Education Collaboration
- Selection of Mentor Sites - To include sites succeeding in General and Special Education Collaboration
- Realignment of CSPD Regions to that of general education Superintendents regions. Regional CSPD leaders encouraged to collaborate with the Professional Development Consortia; a general education professional development network.
- The report of the Special Education Reading Task Force that discusses the importance of including special education teachers and students with disabilities in the California Reading Initiative and the need for school and district wide research based efforts to improve reading instruction, early intervention and prevention, assessment practice linked to research.

Activity 19: Through QAP and the Family Partnership Program, CDE will identify models of research based practices, including partnership and collaboration, and disseminate this information to educators, individuals with disabilities and their families, and providers.

- See information on National and California Family Partnerships on-line databases under Activity 16.
- Matching funds were used to develop a "Research-Based Practices" web site. On-line training assisted families and educators in effectively utilizing information outlined on the web site.
- Through the Collaborative Challenge (a publicly/privately funded effort involving the Association of California School Administrators, the Schwab Foundation for Learning, and CDE), matching funds were used to support the identification of four model programs for collaboration between general education and special education at the local level. Sites then received training and were funded to provide training at regional and state conferences for families and educators.
- CDE has been working with the National Institute on Improving Tools for Educators at the University of Oregon to develop practice guidelines for special education. The guidelines will provide a consistent framework for describing research-verified models, programs, and program components to facilitate dissemination of information to the field. The guidelines will be used to restructure and improve the existing web site on research-based practices.
- An application aligned with the practice guidelines has been developed to identify successful school and district sites that will be trained and supported to serve as mentor sites and provide SIG-funded technical assistance.

Activity 31: CDE will require LEA and SELPA local plans to include the provision of coordinated services across agencies and programs serving individuals with disabilities and their families which will result in improved access to quality programs and services that reflect the diversity and culture of that community.

In year one of SIG application, CDE was "to meet with DDS (Part C lead agency) to determine the content and format of LEA and SELPA plans to address family access to coordinated, culturally appropriate services for infants, toddlers, and preschoolers."

No activity has taken place. CDE cannot require in the SELPA Local Plan what is not in law. This activity must be re-evaluated by PCSE, March 2000, for further action.

Plans for representatives of the LEAs and SELPAs will be involved in these meetings to ensure that the resulting requirement is as appropriate and comprehensive as possible. The resulting outcome should meet the standards for interagency collaboration established through Activity 13, p. 64 of the application.

IV. **Budget Information.** Describe the current status of budget expenditures.

Do you expect to have unexpended funds at the end of the budget period?

No, all funds are encumbered and no unexpended funds are anticipated.

Revised budget (3/25/99) ED FORM NO. 524

Total: 1,840,000

Total of all non-federal contributions as of December 7, 1999:

- Total Non-federal: \$377,353 for 1999-2000 above what was reported in SIG budget application.

Funds not originally reported in SIG budget application. CDE has added State Appropriated funds targeted to QAP to support the CalSTAT project providing implementation oversight to many of the activities addressing QAP (Activities 12, 30, and related work in: 1, 3, 9, 15, 19) of SIG.

- Note: Additional federal state set aside funds for personnel development (Part B & Preschool - IDEA) fund the work of CalSTAT and other contracts; and others agencies as described in SIG application.

WHOM THE GRANT ACTIVITIES ARE DIRECTLY SERVING:

The following are direct recipients of grant activities over the five years of the project: general education and special education teachers/administrators, service providers, early intervention service providers, consumers/families, related agency personnel and service providers, university/college professors, and university students currently enrolled in teaching preparation programs.

GRANT FUNDS DISTRIBUTION:

The administration of SIG is a contractual relationship with Sonoma State University, a pre-service partner. Funds under the grant will be contracted to Parent Training and Information Centers, SELPAs, LEAs, and universities to provide specific technical assistance, training, family/consumer outreach and participation, teacher recruitment and retention components defined in the activities of the grant. Eight-nine percent of the grant funds are expended on personnel development activities. Fund distribution for a specific activity of the Grant is based on the amount allocated in the grant and the special education pupil count for that regional/district or service area.

Over the next five years, grant dollars will be used to fund teacher training and other related activities to improve education for all children, with a focus on better results for individuals with disabilities.

V. **Supplemental Information/Changes.**

Desired Changes needed in Project strategies, activities or outcomes:

- Proposing changes to objectives pursuant to SIG Evaluation Design Task Force recommendations (See Appendix A for details) and PCSE meeting scheduled for March 14-15, 2000.
- Proposing a five year plan for Reading and Behavior training
- Making necessary adjustments to the statewide delivery of training and technical assistance to better support the FMTA efforts following the results of the pilot year of QAP with local education agencies (Summer 2000).

Status of Project as preparing for next budget period:

- March 14-15, 2000 PCSE meeting
- Continued capacity building of the Regional Coordinating Council to deliver training and technical assistance as outlined by SIG. During the first months of SIG, RCC were realigned geographically to the eleven general education county superintendent's regions known as the California Regional Professional Development Resource Agencies and Consortia.
- Developing Scope of Work for year 2 of the SIG and related contracts utilizing a variety of fund streams

Appendix A SIG Objectives

Through the process of reviewing the available data related to SIG Objectives, along with the intent behind each of the objectives as they were developed by PCSE, SIG Evaluation Task Force decided that some changes will need to be made to a number of the objectives. These changes have to do with clarifying the wording or focus of the objective, slight changes in what is being measured.

A preliminary discussion yielded the nature of the changes to be made, which will be further clarified at the next meeting of SIG Evaluation Task Force, and then presented to PCSE for a final determination of the precise changes to be made in the objectives.

What follows are listings of the objectives, with a few brief sentences outlining the nature of the changes to be made.

Student Objectives

- (a) To increase, by at least 10%, the percentage of students with disabilities who are performing equal to or better than the average of students without disabilities on the **STAR State assessment** instruments.

The decision was made to compare both special education and non-special education students to the nationally determined 50th percentile. This is a slight change and still fits within the objective as it is currently stated.

In addition, because the number and percent of students testing at this level was so low, the Task Force recommends that we also measure the number and percent of students testing above the 25th percentile to capture changes in the test scores of a broader range of students.

- (b) To increase, by at least 3% per year, the positive results achieved by individuals with disabilities on the **school and post-school outcomes** developed and articulated with **statewide standards** in year one of the grant period, as defined by the assessment instruments cited in the adopted standards.

As specific outcomes and measures are identified, this objective will need to list sub categories such as Alternate Testing scores, 4th grade Reading scores, Workability outcomes, etc.

- (c) To increase, by at least 3% per year, the percentage of **parents rating** the assistance and support in making **transitions** for their individuals with disabilities at a level of at least "4" (very satisfactory) on a project-developed survey 5-point Likert scale.
- (d) To reduce the rate of **suspensions and expulsions** of students with disabilities by at least 3% per year to reach a level of parity with the rate of general education students, as indicated by data aggregated by the State from school reports.

Because the number of expulsions is so low this feature should be dropped and the focus on suspensions should be emphasized. This is in line with the key performance indicator (KPI) regarding expulsions being dropped as well.

- (e) To increase the percentage of special education students earning a **high school diploma or GED** by at least 3% per year until the percentage is equal or higher than that for non-disabled students, as indicated by data aggregated by the State from school reports.

Teacher/Potential Teacher Objectives

- (a) To reduce the rate of special education teachers with a **30 day substitute emergency permit or 30 day substitute emergency permit waiver** by at least 3% each year, as reported by CCTC.

The available data apparently does not allow for a breakdown of substitutes for special education. This objective and the next are being clarified in work on SIG activities in conjunction with CCTC to address both rates of credentialing and certification of special education staff.

- (b) To reduce the rate of special education teachers who are less than **fully credentialed** (emergency permits and credential waivers) by at least 3% each year, as reported by CCTC.
- (c) To increase by at least 3% per year the percentage of special and general education teachers responding that inservice training's, resources, and/or technical assistance have helped them **implement research-based strategies** in the classroom, particularly those strategies related to increasing reading/language arts skills, academic achievement, and post-school results; improving transitions; ensuring positive behavioral supports; and increasing involvement/collaboration of parents in their child's education, as reported through QAP.

System Objectives

- (a) Improve by at least 10% the extent to which the **needs of individuals with disabilities are addressed** in carrying out **educational reform initiatives**, as demonstrated by the following indicators:
- presence of parent and/or professional representatives of individuals with disabilities on **key initiative committees** at decision-making levels (State, SELPA, and school site)
 - **response to training, technical assistance, and/or resources** provided by the initiative to assist general and special education teachers, other professionals, and families to address the needs of individuals with disabilities
 - increased participation of special education teachers, service providers, and parents in **general education reform initiatives and training**.

For the various facets of this objective as well as system objective d, there is a need to clarify the wording and to separate out and recombine like facets. In the current form, measuring progress toward the objectives would be difficult.

- (b) Increase by 10% the amount of instructional time that California **students with disabilities** spend **in the general education environment** compared to 1998-1999 baseline information in the CASEMIS mainstream data field.

It has been suggested that we drop the specific mention of the baseline year from this objective, particularly since in no other objective is baseline year mentioned. The general approach being taken to the issue of baseline year is to use 1997-98 data when available since that is prior to the PCSE process, which in itself marks the beginning of this system-wide change effort.

- (c) Significantly increase the extent to which State funding of special education is **placement neutral** and reflects **cost-effective** strategies, as described in State statute.
- (d) Increase the **involvement of consumers and parents** of individuals with disabilities in planning, implementing, and evaluating systemic change/educational reforms, as demonstrated by the presence of parents and/or consumers representing diverse communities on local and Statewide committees related to systemic change/educational reform.